A U M

This mighty Soul unborn grows not old, nor dies, for the Soul is immortal and fearless. The Soul is the fearless Eternal. He grows one with the Eternal, the fearless Eternal, who knows this. —*Song of Life.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXI December, 1942 No. 2

NATURE'S OWN

SOME there are who take up impressions, whether feeling or thought reactions, as a sponge soaks up water, and as easily release them. That such superficial hearts and facile brains often pass in the world for understanding minds is but another indictment of our sense of values.

Directly opposite are those whose natures may be compared to Mother Earth herself. As the ground absorbs rain, gently and slowly, so do they absorb, not learning, but knowledge. After a "rain," their topsoil may appear muddy, but let the sun come forth, and soon, in the dry clean earth, inherent seed-ideas, nourished by the waters that have gone so deep, begin to sprout and grow. Such natures are glossed over, ignored, belittled and unappreciated, and our world is the worse for it.

But the Soul recognizes these true men. Nature knows them for her own. And when, the veil torn off by sorrow, trial or despair, a man seeks his brother's help, it is not to the glib-tongued and casual that he goes, but to these, the comforters, the compassionate. They give him not words only, but deeds. The power of example and experience is theirs, for their knowledge was not deposited for easy access in an air-tight vault; it was invested in the business of life, put immediately to practical work. These souls, when tested, are found to *know* and not depend on reason.

We all meet those quiet men who, depreciating their own wisdom and accepting in their modesty the world's judgment, say, "I know not." On the "great occasion," indeed, they may seem tongue-tied, shy and stammering. But in the little things and on small occasions—the real crises—their touch is calm, sure and true. Words rise from their hearts instantly, effortlessly, and each wipes away a tear and smoothes a troubled brow.

We say, "Didn't think he had it in him." True enough, for we were thoughtless and near-sighted, when clear thinking and clairvoyance were needed. Unsophisticated, we had concentrated on the magic crystal of the "brilliant mind," where all is sparkle, the senses caught and fascinated by the illusion of depth. Mistaking the crystal's clearness for clarity of perception, reflection for selfshining light, and attraction for beauty, we neglected to read character. We were too preoccupied with sense-perception to perceive the reality at root. This is called the "sense" of separateness.

Say the Old Teachings: *Close fast thy senses against the great dire heresy of Separateness that weans thee from the rest.* Our senses point to the separation of one body from another, and are properly used to distinguish between forms. But the soul, perceiving without benefit of sense or brain, or even mind, sees the unity of life or spirit. Nor on that plane is there any separation between knowing and doing, between seeing, and acting on the basis seen. To the soul, perception *is* action. Correlative with this is the fact that only soul action can arouse soul power. Only acting for and as the Self will arouse the Spiritual Will, will bring self-realization.

Who see with the senses, act with the senses, and follow the "Eye" doctrine. Who see as soul act as soul, and are devotees of the "Heart" doctrine. Thus are defined the *many* and the *few.*

With physical eyes we see each other, when bodies are together. With mental eyes we see each other when minds are together, though bodies be neither present nor known to us. With the eye of soul we see each other, and know, though minds and bodies be absent and even unfamiliar, our souls are together—one with all brother souls.

This is the season of our true birth, for we *are* the sun gods. The Bright Spirits who incarnated in this sun-cycle sought to reawaken our memory of godhood, by representing, before our very eyes, the *Spirit in the body.* The sun gods came to remind us of our one-time high Purpose—to *seek* to help and teach others. The symbol they chose is mighty and glorious—the visible Sun. See, they said, sunbeams are not different, sunlight is not many, *the Children of Light are one!*

Matter, deprived of its soul and spirit, or its divine essence, cannot speak to the human heart. But the identity of the soul and spirit, of real, immortal man, as Theosophy teaches us, once proven and deep-rooted in our hearts, would lead us far on the road of real charity and brotherly goodwill. —H. P. B.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN

THE tragic situation of the Christian world is never more evident than during the Christmas season, which has become little more than a commercialized travesty of the primitive conception of the birth of the Christ. Yet Christmas is also a time when the constricted channels of the human heart open a little wider than usual, when the almost forgotten flame of altruism gains new life from the current of renewal that courses through the occult universe. There were Christmas seasons during the last war when the soldiers on both sides laid down their arms and sang carols of their common tradition. For a moment at least, clear-voiced and free, the spirit of brotherhood reached across the desolation that was known as "no man's land," and a simple song revealed the truth of human unity that years of mutual destruction could not obliterate. Then, as irrationally as the dogmas of the religion to which both sides subscribed, the great guns roared. Christmas Day had gone.

The fratricidal wars of Christendom are symptoms of much deeper contradictions which are so embedded in the thought of the West that they serve as "first principles" of action, tainting even the most elevated reaches of religious philosophy. The words of a Great Teacher, written in 1880, give in a brief paragraph the correct diagnosis, which no modern thinker has even suspected:

> To be true, religion and philosophy must offer the solution of every problem. That the world is in such a bad condition, morally, is a conclusive evidence that none of its religions and philosophies, those of the civilized races less than any other, has ever possessed the TRUTH. The right and logical explanations on the subject of the problems of the great dual principles, right and wrong, good and evil, liberty and despotism, pain and pleasure, egotism and altruism, are as impossible to them now as they were 1880 years ago. They are as far from the solution as they ever were; but to these problems there must be somewhere a consistent solution, and if our doctrines will show their competence to offer it, then the world will be the first to confess that *ours* must be the true philosophy, the true religion, the true light, which gives truth and nothing but the TRUTH. (THEOSOPHY, X, 69.)

It is the greatest irony of the Karma of the West that the sublime truths implicit in the Christ myth have been so formalized by centuries of tradition, given moving intensity by the tears of millions of suffering devotees, as to have blinded the Christian world to the

philosophical and moral weaknesses of its religion. H. P. B. wrote in *Isis Unveiled:*

> Drop out from Christianity the personality of Jesus, so sublime, because of its unparalleled simplicity, and what remains? History and comparative theology echo back the melancholy answer, "A crumbling skeleton formed of the oldest Pagan myths!"

—myths, moreover, whose original meaning has long since been forgotten, or was never understood, even at the beginning when they were borrowed from the religions of antiquity. In *The Secret Doctrine,* H. P. B. explains that the Christ, "the Logos, or the God in Space and the Saviour on Earth, is but one of the echoes of . . . sorely misunderstood Wisdom." The "Fall" of man, she shows, was according to the laws of egoic evolution: "Once landed on, and having touched this planet of dense matter, no snow-white wings of the highest angel can remain immaculate, or the *Avatar* (or incarnation) be perfect, as every such Avatar is the fall of a God into generation." Thus the true Christ is the potential God in every man, the Fall but a necessity of the descent into matter. Yet see what Theology has made of this descent:

> . . . the metaphorical FALL, and as metaphorical atonement and crucifixion, led Western Humanity through roads knee-deep in blood. Worse than all, they led it to believe in the dogma of the evil spirit distinct from the spirit of all good, whereas the former lives in all matter and pre-eminently in man. Finally it created the God-slandering dogma of Hell and eternal perdition; it spread a thick film between the higher intuitions of man and divine verities; and, most pernicious result of all, it made people remain ignorant of the fact that there were no fiends, no dark demons in the Universe before man's own appearance on this, and probably on other earths. Henceforth the people were led to accept, as the problematical consolation for this world's sorrows, the thought of original sin. (*S. D.* II, 484.)

While theology holds the interest and belief of only the very few today, the stultifying effects of these dogmas have hardly been diminished in the slow transition from blind belief to apathy toward doctrinal Christianity. It is still typical of the West to seek "outside" for the source of good, to find in externalities the causes of the evil that men suffer. The "thick film" remains to obscure and mislead the intuitions of the best of men. Liberal spirits whose minds have long ago rejected all the traditional beliefs of Christianity, so far as their own religious life is concerned, nevertheless fail to see the importance of a philosophic religion for the masses. They are indifferent to the hold of the personal god idea on ordinary mankind, they

care little whether the soul be immortal or not, so they say, and consecrate their lives to good works and the practice of the Christ-life as they understand it. But their austerities count for little except as intimates are influenced by the example; the questions rising unanswered in less disciplined souls are little satisfied by isolated instances of sainthood, nor will the Christianized socialism of these leaders appeal to more than the very few.

As the Master wrote, "religion and philosophy must offer the solution of every problem," but the method adopted by Christian reformers is to ignore every problem but immediate material disaster and physical suffering. Of necessity, the causes are overlooked.

But *why,* under karmic law, is the true nature of the problem not recognized? Why should it be that these earnest souls, longing to help their fellows, cannot see where their weakness lies—in their lack of philosophy?

This, again, is explained by the very practices of Christianity itself, its misuse over long centuries of the most sacred ideas. Prayer, once the psychological and moral discipline reserved for Initiates, has been made a public thing, a matter of ostentation and, even worse, of supplication to an outside god. Psychic perversion of this order was inevitably destined to sap the moral vitality of western peoples. Prayer, as practiced in Christendom, at once betrays the complete lack of psychological knowledge in the Western world. Then, consider the centuries of scholastic debate concerning the nature of God and "His Will." Of the Absolute Reality, which Christians have had the temerity to call their "God," a secret commentary says:

> *. . . the Absolute . . . must never be mentioned in words or speech* LEST IT SHOULD TAKE AWAY SOME OF OUR SPIRITUAL ENERGIES THAT ASPIRE *towards* ITS *state, gravitating ever onward unto* IT *spiritually, as the whole physical universe gravitates towards* ITS *manifested centre—cosmically.* (*S. D.* I, 290.)

European civilization reached the peak of its material culture, fed almost entirely on a religion that explained away its God in great detail and equally great contradiction in every other sentence of its doctrinal writings. From the early Christian fathers to contemporary theologians writing in such journals as the *Christian Century,* the futile attempt to define the Indefinable, to interpret the Unspeakable, and to ascribe will and thought to Non-Being Itself, has continued without surcease. Yet despite all this learning "about God," Christian civilization stands convicted through the centuries of nameless immoralities and systematized blasphemy. Its cruelties during the Dark Ages nearly outdo the inhuman disregard of human suffering

practiced by the Carthaginians, whose personal deity, Moloch, demanded the sacrifice of little children when disaster threatened their city. So late as 1898, "good Christians" sought the propagation of their faith by might of arms, the Protestant Church being eager for the conquest of the Philippines for the furtherance of the religion of Christ!

Here is evidence of the "utter deformation of the intellectual principle," owing, as a Teacher wrote, "to the deliberate surrender of intellect and its imprisonment in the narrow grooves of bigotry and superstition." Further proof is in another statement from the same pen: "The world in general, and Christendom especially, left for 2,000 years to the *régime* of a personal God, as well as to its political and social systems based on that idea, has now proved a failure."

A Theosophical Adept wrote to an English theosophist of the early days of the Movement that the chief object of the Brotherhood was to deliver humanity of the "nightmare" of the personal God idea. Elsewhere he spoke of the association of the conceptions of anthropomorphism with sexual aberrations—a connection that will bear some pondering. Indeed, it is clear from the Secret Doctrine teaching that the Religion of the West is a *sexual* religion, descended from the Atlanteans who worshipped first form and matter, then themselves, and finally adopted the phallicism which today reigns supreme in exoteric Christianity. The literal obsession of the West by the dark mystery of sex has the beginning of an explanation in this hint from H. P. B. Recall the statement concerning the relation between the brain centers through which spiritual understanding is possible, and the *medulla oblongata,* and the passage about the "thick film" which hides divine verities from human intuition becomes still clearer. The pall of this Karma of the West remains to darken every Christian mind, and the minds of even those non-Christians who as yet have not learned to understand the insidious effects of the personal God idea and to guard against them.

Thus centuries of Christian history illustrate the "dire results" which must ensue when the taint of selfishness transforms the spiritual into the psychic. Even those who adorn the Christian faith with lives of self-sacrifice, besides the immediate good they leave behind, have also the Karma of having confirmed others in beliefs that degrade instead of elevate. The mystics and saints of religious history are taken by many thousands as testimony that the imitation of Christ—the exoteric figure of gospel legend—is enough to guide any man to the highest good. This leads to a brooding by the aspirant on the possible *personal* relation he may enter into with his

Savior or his God, building, as the years of such devotions go by, an impenetrable psychic cocoon that closes the mind of the ego to the great abstract truths of impersonal philosophy. Many the Sapta Rishis who emerge from such chrysalises, Antaskarana broken by complete absorption in the personal God idea.

It was for reasons such as these that H. P. Blavatsky recorded one of her most definite prophecies, in the article, "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels":

> Belief in the Bible *literally,* and in a *carnalized* Christ, will not last a quarter of a century longer. The Churches will have to part with their cherished dogmas, or the 20th century will witness the downfall and ruin of all Christendom, and with it, belief even in a Christos, as pure Spirit. The very name has now become obnoxious, and theological Christianity must die out, *never to resurrect again* in its present form. This, in itself, would be the happiest solution of all, were there no danger from the natural reaction which is sure to follow: crass materialism will be the consequence and the result of centuries of blind faith, unless the loss of old ideals is replaced by other ideals, unassailable, because *universal,* and built on the rock of eternal truths instead of the shifting sands of human fancy. Pure immateriality must replace, in the end, the terrible anthropomorphism of those ideals in the conceptions of our modern dogmatists.

In the perspective of history, and in consideration of the dark veils which cover the spiritual sight of the West, the task assumed by H. P. B. grows to gigantic proportions. How, in the nature of things, was it, is it, possible for these terrible obstacles to be overcome, for the soul of man to be aroused from the lethargy of ages? The hope, and hope there must be, or this great Movement would never have been set in motion, must lie in the truth so degraded by Christianity, in the Christ-idea, reborn and taught again in this epoch of nineteenth and twentieth century Theosophy. These truths *are* impacted in the imperishable center of the being of every man, and in the life cycle of each one must come a moment when, for him, his inner sight will open. What he then sees will depend, first, upon himself, his resolve and his Karma. But it will depend, second, upon the work of those who have found the way before him. As the very struggles of existence are preparing more and more of mankind to see, so, in this cycle of transition, should theosophists be preparing themselves to show the way to others, and to understand who those others may be. Opportunities may come sooner than we think.

GENIUS

"Genius! thou gift of Heaven, thou light divine!
Amid what dangers art thou doom'd to shine.
Oft will the body's weakness check thy force,
Oft damp thy vigour, and impede thy course;
And trembling nerves compel thee to restrain
Thy nobler efforts to contend with pain;
Or want, sad guest! . . ." —CRABBE.

AMONG many problems hitherto unsolved in the Mystery of Mind, stands prominent the question of Genius. Whence, and what is genius, its *raison d'être,* the causes of its excessive rarity? Is it indeed "a gift of Heaven"? And if so, why such gifts to one, and dullness of intellect, or even idiocy, the doom of another? To regard the appearance of men and women of genius as a mere accident, a prize of blind chance, or, as dependent on physical causes alone, is only thinkable to a materialist. As an author truly says, there remains then, only this alternative: to agree with the believer in a *personal* god "to refer the appearance of every single individual to a *special act of divine will and creative energy,*" or "to recognize, in the whole succession of such individuals, one great act of some will, expressed in an eternal inviolable law."

Genius, as Coleridge defined it, is certainly—to every outward appearance, at least—"the faculty of growth"; yet to the inward intuition of man, it is a question whether it is genius—an abnormal aptitude of mind—that develops and grows, or the physical brain, *its vehicle,* which becomes through some mysterious process fitter to receive and manifest *from within outwardly* the innate and divine nature of man's over-soul. Perchance, in their unsophisticated wisdom, the philosophers of old were nearer truth than are our modern wiseacres, when they endowed man with a tutelar deity, a Spirit whom they called *genius.* The substance of this entity, to say nothing of its *essence*—observe the distinction, reader,—and the presence of both, manifests itself according to the organism of the person it informs. As Shakespeare says of the genius of great men—what we perceive of his substance "is not here"—

"For what you see is but the smallest part. . . .
But were the whole frame here,
It is of such a spacious, lofty pitch,
Your roof were not sufficient to contain it. . . ."

This is precisely what the Esoteric philosophy teaches. The flame of genius is lit by no anthropomorphic hand, save that of one's own

---

NOTE.—This article first appeared in *Lucifer* for November, 1889.

Spirit. It is the very nature of the Spiritual Entity itself, of our *Ego,* which keeps on weaving new life-woofs into the web of reincarnation on the loom of time, from the beginnings to the ends of the great Life-Cycle.* This it is that asserts itself stronger than in the average man, through its personality; so that what we call "the manifestations of genius" in a person, are only the more or less successful efforts of that EGO to assert itself on the outward plane of its objective form—the man of clay—in the matter-of-fact, daily life of the latter. The EGOS of a Newton, an Æschylus, or a Shakespeare, are of the same essence and substance as the Egos of a yokel, an ignoramus, a fool, or even an idiot; and the self-assertion of their informing *genii* depends on the physiological and material construction of the physical man. No Ego differs from another Ego, in its primordial or original essence and nature. That which makes one mortal a great man and of another a vulgar, silly person is, as said, the quality and make-up of the physical shell or casing, and the adequacy or inadequacy of brain and body to transmit and give expression to the light of the real, *Inner* man; and this aptness or inaptness is, in its turn, the result of Karma. Or, to use another simile, physical man is the musical instrument, and the Ego, the performing artist. The potentiality of perfect melody of sound, is in the former—the instrument—and no skill of the latter can awaken a faultless harmony out of a broken or badly made instrument. This harmony depends on the fidelity of transmission, by word or act, to the objective plane, of the unspoken divine thought in the very depths of man's subjective or inner nature. Physical man may—to follow our simile—be a priceless Stradivarius or a cheap and cracked fiddle, or again a mediocrity between the two, in the hands of the Paganini who ensouls him.

All ancient nations knew this. But though all had their Mysteries and their Hierophants, not all could be equally taught the great metaphysical doctrine; and while a few elect received such truths at their initiation, the masses were allowed to approach them with the greatest caution and only within the farthest limits of fact. "From the DIVINE ALL proceeded Amun, the Divine Wisdom . . . give it not to the unworthy," says a Book of Hermes. Paul, the "wise *Master-Builder,*"† (I *Cor.* III, 10) but echoes Thoth-Hermes when telling the Corinthians "We speak Wisdom among them that are perfect (the initiated) . . . *divine* Wisdom in a MYSTERY, even the *hidden* Wisdom." (*Ibid.* II, 7.)

---

*The period of one full Manvantara composed of Seven Rounds.

†A term absolutely theurgic, masonic and occult. Paul, by using it, declares himself an Initiate having the right to initiate others.

Yet, to this day the Ancients are accused of blasphemy and fetishism for their 'hero worship.' But have the modern historians ever fathomed the cause of such 'worship'! We believe not. Otherwise they would be the first to become aware that that which was 'worshipped,' or rather that to which honours were rendered was neither the man of clay, nor the *personality*—the Hero or Saint So-and-So, which still prevails in the Roman Church, a church which beatifies the body rather than the soul—but the divine imprisoned Spirit, the *exiled* "god" *within* that personality. Who, in the profane world, is aware that even the majority of the magistrates (the *Archons* of Athens, mistranslated in the Bible as 'Princes')—whose official duty it was to prepare the city for such processions, were ignorant of the true significance of the alleged "worship"?

Verily was Paul right in declaring that "we speak wisdom . . . not the wisdom of this world . . . which none of the *Archons* of this (profane) world knew," but the *hidden wisdom* of the MYSTERIES. For, as again the Epistle of the apostle implies, the language of the Initiates and their secrets no *profane,* not even an 'Archon' or ruler *outside the fane* of the sacred Mysteries, knoweth; none "save the Spirit of man (the *Ego*) which is *in him.*" (*Ib.* v. 11.)

Were Chapters II. and III. of I Corinthians ever translated in the Spirit in which they were written—even their dead letter is now disfigured—the world might receive strange revelations. Among other things it would have a key to many hitherto unexplained rites of ancient Paganism, one of which is the mystery of this same Hero-worship. And it would learn that if the streets of the city that honoured one such man, were strewn with roses for the passage of the Hero of the day; if every citizen was called to bow in reverence to him who was so feasted; and if both priest and poet vied in their zeal to immortalize the hero's name after his death—occult philosophy tells us the reason why this was done.

"Behold," it saith, "in every manifestation of genius—*when combined with virtue*—in the warrior or the Bard, the great painter, artist, statesman or man of Science, who soars high above the heads of the vulgar herd, the undeniable presence of the celestial exile, the divine *Ego* whose jailor thou art, Oh man of matter!" Thus, that which we call *deification* applied to the immortal God within, not to the dead walls of the human tabernacle that contained him. And this was done in tacit and silent recognition of the efforts made by the divine captive who, under the most adverse circumstances of incarnation, still succeeded in manifesting himself.

Occultism, therefore, teaches nothing new in asserting the above philosophical axiom. Enlarging upon the broad metaphysical truism, it only gives it a finishing touch by explaining certain details. It teaches, for instance, that the presence in man of various creative powers—called genius in their collectivity—is due to no blind chance, to no innate qualities through hereditary tendencies—though that which is known as atavism may often intensify these faculties—but to an accumulation of individual antecedent experiences of the *Ego* in its preceding life, and lives. For, though omniscient in its essence and nature, it still requires experience through its *personalities* of the things of earth, earthy on the objective plane, in order to apply the fruition of that abstract omniscience to them. And, adds our philosophy—the cultivation of certain aptitudes throughout a long series of past incarnations must finally culminate in some one life, in a blooming forth as *genius,* in one or another direction.

Great Genius, therefore, if true and innate, and not merely an abnormal expansion of our human intellect—can never copy or condescend to imitate, but will ever be original, *sui generis* in its creative impulses and realizations. Like those gigantic Indian lilies that shoot out from the clefts and fissures of the cloud-nursing, and bare rocks on the highest plateaux of the Nilgiri Hills, true Genius needs but an opportunity to spring forth into existence and blossom in the sight of all on the most arid soil, for its stamp is always unmistakable. To use a popular saying, innate genius, like murder, will out sooner or later, and the more it will have been suppressed and hidden, the greater will be the flood of light thrown by the sudden eruption. On the other hand artificial genius, so often confused with the former, and which in truth, is but the outcome of long studies and training, will never be more than, so to say, the flame of a lamp burning outside the portal of the fane; it may throw a long trail of light across the road, but it leaves the inside of the building in darkness. And, as every faculty and property in Nature is dual—*i.e.,* each may be made to serve two ends, evil as well as good—so will artificial genius betray itself. Born out of the chaos of terrestrial sensations, of perceptive and retentive faculties, yet of finite memory, it will ever remain the slave of its body; and that body, owing to its unreliability and the natural tendency of matter to confusion, will not fail to lead even the greatest *genius,* so called, back into its own primordial element, which is chaos again, or *evil,* or earth.

Thus between the true and the artificial genius, one born from the light of the immortal Ego, the other from the evanescent will-o'-the-wisp of the terrestrial or purely human intellect and the animal soul,

there is a chasm, to be spanned only by him who aspires ever onward; who never loses sight, even when in the depths of matter, of that guiding star the Divine Soul and mind, or what we call *Buddhi-Manas*. The latter does not require, as does the former, cultivation. The words of the poet who asserts that the lamp of genius—

> "If not protected, pruned, and fed with care,
> Soon dies, or runs to waste with fitful glare—"

—can apply only to artificial genius, the outcome of culture and of purely intellectual acuteness. It is not the direct light of the *Manasa putra,* the "Sons of Wisdom," for true genius lit at the flame of our higher nature, or the EGO, cannot die. This is why it is so very rare. Lavater calculated that "the proportion of genius (in general) to the vulgar, is like one to a million; but genius without tyranny, without pretension, that judges the weak with equity, the superior with humanity, and equals with justice, is like one in ten millions." This is indeed interesting, though not too complimentary to *human* nature, if, by "genius," Lavater had in mind only the higher sort of human intellect, unfolded by cultivation, "protected, pruned, and fed," and not the genius we speak of. Moreover such genius is always apt to lead to the extremes of weal or woe him, through whom this artificial light of the terrestrial mind manifests. Like the good and bad genii of old with whom human genius is made so appropriately to share the name, it takes its helpless possessor by the hand and leads him, one day to the pinnacles of fame, fortune, and glory, but to plunge him on the following day into an abyss of shame, despair, often of crime.

But as, according to the great Physiognomist, there is more of the former than of the latter kind of genius in this our world, because, as Occultism teaches us, it is easier for the personality with its acute physical senses and *tatwas* to gravitate toward the lower quaternary than to soar to its triad—modern philosophy, though quite proficient in treating this lower place of genius, knows nothing of its higher spiritual form—the "one in ten millions." Thus it is only natural that confusing one with the other, the best modern writers should have failed to define *true* genius. As a consequence, we continually hear and read a good deal of that which to the Occultist seems quite paradoxical. "Genius requires cultivation," says one; "Genius is vain and self-sufficient" declares another; while a third will go on defining the *divine light* but to dwarf it on the Procrustean bed of his own intellectual narrowmindedness. He will talk of the great eccentricity of genius, and allying it as a general rule with an "inflammable constitution," will even show it "a prey to every passion but seldom delicacy of taste!" (Lord Kaimes.) It is useless to argue with such,

or tell them that, original, and great genius puts out the most dazzling rays of human intellectuality, as the sun quenches the flame-light of a fire in an open field; that it is never eccentric; though always *sui generis;* and that no man endowed with true genius can ever give way to his physical animal passions. In the view of an humble Occultist, only such a grand altruistic character as that of Buddha or Jesus, and of their few close imitators, can be regarded, in our historical cycle, as fully developed GENIUS.

Hence, true genius has small chance indeed of receiving its due in our age of conventionalities, hypocrisy and time-serving. As the world grows in civilization, it expands in fierce selfishness, and stones its true prophets and geniuses for the benefit of its apeing shadows. Alone the surging masses of the ignorant millions, the great people's heart, are capable of sensing intuitionally a true "great soul" full of divine love for mankind, of god-like compassion for suffering man. Hence the populace alone is still capable of recognizing a genius, as without such qualities no man has a right to the name. No genius can be now found in Church or State, and this is proven on their own admission. It seems a long time since in the XIII century the "Angelic Doctor" snubbed Pope Innocent IV who, boasting of the millions got by him from the sale of absolutions and indulgences, remarked to Aquinas that "the age of the Church is past in which she said 'Silver and gold have I none!' 'True,' was the ready reply; but the age is also past when she could say to a paralytic, 'Rise up and walk'." And yet from that time, and far, far earlier, to our own day the hourly crucifixion of their ideal Master both by Church and State has never ceased. While every Christian State breaks with its laws and customs, with every commandment given in the Sermon on the Mount, the Christian Church justifies and approves of this through her own Bishops who despairingly proclaim "A Christian State *impossible* on Christian Principles." Hence—no Christ-like (or "Buddha-like") way of life is possible in civilized States.

The occultist then, to whom "true genius is a synonym of self-existent and infinite mind," mirrored more or less faithfully by man, fails to find in the modern definitions of the term anything approaching correctness. In its turn the esoteric interpretation of Theosophy is sure to be received with derision. The very idea that every man with a "soul" in him, is the vehicle of a genius, will appear supremely absurd, even to believers, while the materialist will fall foul of it as a "crass superstition." As to the popular feeling—the only approximately correct one because purely intuitional, it will not be even taken into account. The same elastic and convenient epithet "superstition" will, once more, be made to explain why there never

was yet a universally recognised genius—whether of one or the other kind—without a certain amount of weird, fantastic and often uncanny, tales and legends attaching themselves to so unique a character, dogging and even surviving him. Yet it is the unsophisticated alone, and therefore only the so-called *uneducated* masses, just because of that lack of sophistical reasoning in them, who feel, whenever coming in contact with an abnormal, out-of-the-way character, that there is in him something more than the mere mortal man of flesh and intellectual attributes. And feeling themselves in the presence of that which in the enormous majority is ever hidden, of something incomprehensible to their matter-of-fact minds, they experience the same awe that popular masses felt in days of old when their fancy, often more unerring than cultured reason, created of their heroes gods, teaching:

> . . . . "The weak to bend, the proud to pray
> To powers unseen and mightier than they. . ."

This is now called SUPERSTITION. . .

But what is Superstition? True, we dread that which we cannot clearly explain to ourselves. Like children in the dark, we are all of us apt, the educated equally with the ignorant, to people that darkness with phantoms of our own creation; but these "phantoms" prove in no wise that that "darkness"—which is only another term for the *invisible* and the *unseen*—is really empty of any *Presence* save our own. So that if in its exaggerated form, "superstition" is a weird incubus, as a belief in things *above* and *beyond* our physical senses, yet it is also a modest acknowledgment that there are things in the universe, and around us, of which we knew nothing. In this sense "superstition" becomes not an unreasonable feeling of half wonder and half dread, mixed with admiration and reverence, or with fear, according to the dictates of our intuition. And this is far more reasonable than to repeat with the too-learned wiseacres that there is nothing "nothing whatever, in that darkness"; nor can there be anything since they, the wiseacres, have failed to discern it.

E pur se muove! Where there is smoke there must be fire; where there is a steamy vapour there must be water. Our claim rests but upon one eternal axiomatic truth: *nihil sine causa.* Genius and undeserved suffering, prove an immortal Ego and Reincarnation in our world. As for the rest, *i.e.*, the obloquy and derision with which such theosophical doctrines are met, Fielding—a sort of Genius in his way, too—has covered our answer over a century ago. Never did he utter a greater truth than on the day he wrote that *"If superstition makes a man a fool,* SCEPTICISM MAKES HIM MAD."

H. P. B.

THEOSOPHISTS AND INDIA

QUESTION: On the first page of the Introduction to *The Secret Doctrine* H. P. B. speaks of "the Secret Doctrine of the East." Numerous scattered references in her works and in those of W. Q. J. indicate that the psychological salvation of the West lies in an understanding of the philosophy of the ancients, now preserved in its entirety in India and Tibet. It is further suggested that one day India will again rise to greatness. Just what is the connection between the present Western Theosophical student and modern India? Would the closeness of India to the heritage of Wisdom Religion suggest that the social and political problems of that country are of particular practical concern to Theosophists? If Westerners are to look indirectly to India for spiritual leadership, should they also look to India for guidance in social, political and economic matters? To what extent should Theosophical publications and discussions deal with Gandhi and the Nationalist Movement, for instance?

Answer: The inference that Theosophical Westerners should feel more concerned with the problems of India than those of their own country was branded fallacious by H. P. B. Duty forever begins at home, and the renouncing of one's own national obligations in order to visit or live in India has never led to anything save acquirement by the individual of a mystic aura of self-importance. Two things, however, must be considered, for both India and America are unique as localities in which there will eventually be evident new and ascending cycles of enlightenment. America is to become the home of a new race, in the soil of which a richer appreciation of Theosophy can be nurtured. India will some day see a renaissance of spiritual vision. In order for these two lands to serve each other, India must understand and meet problems of a political and social nature, while America should acquire a philosophical insight such as the old traditions of Eastern thought contain. Each tradition must complement itself with previously lacking elements.

The channels of effort inaugurated by H. P. B. in the original Theosophical Society must have been consciously prototypal. In America the Society was concerned with illustrating the errors of immature religious and scientific thought, preparing the way for a foundation in the metaphysics necessary to support right ethics. In India the work of the Society was different, emphasizing the practical rather than the theoretical. The Indian National Congress may be said to have grown from the social vision of Theosophical minds.

In both instances, weaknesses of the present "mass mind" were considered. The hope of India did not lie among the psychic wrecks, the false ascetics nor the spiritless karmic results of the caste system. The hope of America was not in mass fascination for bizarre psychic phenomena. But from each might come leaders and philosophers who could begin a new cycle. And this has in measure happened already. Virile Western philosophical minds have existed, free from the clouds and cobwebs long preventing the Hindus from understanding practical applications of their own heritage. If there *are* representatives of a highly occult wisdom, their work must be to help inspire philosophical writers and social reformers! If the proper philosophical conditions are set up in America, this will come, as men *earn* inspiration. If India evolves from the nebulous into the practical, it will come. India needs the practical, America the "theoretical." Only one source of knowledge can bring to each the balance.

America has passed rapidly through stages of philosophical misunderstanding, as though she were clearing away debris before building a structure of enduring thought. By successive stages materialism has replaced stifling religion, and now has paused to question itself. In India a new attitude towards internal and economic problems is emerging. The philosophy of non-violence is practical pioneering. Whether or no its present applications are theoretically right or wrong, the technique and its effectiveness open up a virgin field. Why should not this be of interest to Western Theosophists? As a social manifestation, Gandhi's movement demands consideration from all Theosophists, whatever their views on international relations. *Thoreau,* not a Hindu mystic, was Gandhi's greatest inspiration. And the inspiration behind the philosophical trend of those great independent American thinkers, Thoreau and Emerson, presaging the direct Theosophical Movement of H. P. B. was in large part the classics of India. Unheralded cooperation between the Indian East and American West may be a theme of the future, one which only the Theosophists can fully understand.

The new era of Western Occultism has as its mission, largely entrusted to the hands of Theosophists, to furnish to the West that which it can never get from the East; to push forward and raise high on the circular path of evolution now rolling West, the light that lighteth every man, the light of the true self. Western Occultism is not to be something wholly different from and opposed to what so many know, or think they know, as Eastern Occultism. It is to be the Western side of the one great whole of which the true Eastern is the other half.

—W. Q. J.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

Duly Established Channels

IN our last was shown the nature of the painful conflict that exists between the man of true scientific genius and the norm of his surroundings. It was pointed out that the very peculiarities which most make for success in discovery tend most to set the victim apart as "queer," and hence to work against acceptance of those discoveries.

Dr. Watson shows how this social resistance becomes crystallized and officialized through institutions. The result is that the very success of science, which has brought recognition and endowments, has gone far to entomb it under the weight of its possessions. His revelations on this score must be intensely interesting to Theosophists, who have seen the downfall of true religion follow from just such a cause, who have seen the early stage of the Theosophical Movement of this period crumble into corruption by the same process. Even in the United Lodges, which dispensed as far as humanly possible with all vestiges of institutionalism, Theosophists find themselves at grips with the ever-present tendency toward orthodoxy and mental stasis within themselves and within their comrades. We seem here to have a basic Karmic law akin to inductance in an electric circuit by which the very power of the current is used to choke it. Failure is inherent when success takes this form.

Essentially, the situation is summed up in this passage:

> Let us imagine that certain desirable temperamental tendencies have been built into the character of the embryonic scientist by the social and physiological circumstances of his birth, growth, and upbringing. Now comes a trial of strength between these tendencies and the organized customs of the adult society. The searching activities of the scientific man provide, in the first place, an undifferentiated mass of facts and fancies. From this a socially acceptable interpretation is gradually sifted out. The social forces *select* certain of the scientist's abilities and aptitudes for approval. The social organization acts as a *filter* on the scientific results which are candidates for recognition. Where the belief and practice of the society are sound, this process leads to scientific truth. Where the social features of scientific organization are faulty or *based on something other than love of truth* (for instance, on the demands of stability, power, or ambition), this selecting process will lead to error. But this sort of error will have, in the eyes of all except intellectually-honest insiders, all the authority of the scientific tradition behind it. . . . (Watson, David Lindsay, *Scientists Are Human,* London: Watts and Co., 1938, p. 50.)

Dr. Watson thinks that industrial research often offers a healthier outlook. The corporation is concerned only with the work of the researcher, not with his personal habits, morals, or peculiarities. Moreover, there is a monetary premium on original work which does not exist in the case of the institution. However, we venture to say that the field is not as rosy as Dr. Watson may imagine. In the first place, with few exceptions, research must have definite financial value in order to receive continued support. Sometimes that worth is not synonymous with social value or even material utility. There is little room for soaring into the higher flights of discovery, since the end is immediate and practical, and, for the most part, the scientific genius is working as a subordinate to men whose principal talent is the financial evaluation of results. Seldom does the most interesting research also have the highest economic value. Thus a conflict of purposes sometimes arises, discouraging and disheartening to the genius and exasperating to his "practical" superiors.

The discouragements and difficulties met with by the genius in institutions have a close parallel with those encountered in industry. The socialistically-minded for example, are accustomed to look toward the Soviet Union as the Ultima Thule of the scientific genius. But the truth is, that the Union being one huge business concern, the evils of industrialized science are met with throughout, with fewer academic institutions for refuge. Since the only officially recognized teleology is pure atheism, the scientist who finds himself skirting the metaphysical borders—in which region lies the greatest of all recent discoveries in the West—finds himself at the same time in a region of great official frigidity. To cramp the scientific mind into duly materialistic channels, a distinction has been made between "proletarian science" and other kinds. For instance, Einstein's former "curved space" and "closed universe"—with which Theosophists disagree also, but for other reasons—is "capitalist science," because it is supposed to have some vague connection with the possibility of a personal god. If commercial considerations on the one hand, and institutionalized orthodoxy on the other, are a curse to the scientific genius, what must be a control by inverted religion of this type?

In no land is the genius of today either really free or entirely happy. Scholars, in general, feel their work needs clarification and integration with the work of other scholars, and with the outside world (see Lookout, p. 86, "Science, Philosophy and Religion").

Says Dr. Watson:

> I want you to come with me to visit a certain influential scientific administrator. The office is empty when we arrive, for he has been

> away for two weeks on a holiday. His desk is piled high with reports of investigations which he has had no time to read. When he does arrive he looks very severe and important, but he turns out to have a charming manner. . . . This is the man that decides who shall prosecute what scientific research in these spacious laboratories.
>
> He is a "good executive." That is, he never drops a stitch in ordering supplies or supervising the janitor service. And he makes an immense beaming impression on wealthy visitors. But is this man competent to decide the basic policy of the institution? Has he enough vision to dispense with the mountains of slag, which we are describing in these pages, and find the glittering crystal of truth beneath? Maybe yes. Maybe no. All I would say is that the men of profound insight whom I have known intimately have seldom had such a resemblance to a new-model motor-car—fitting the fancies of pharisees with such precision as this man—and so well equipped to proceed at top speed no matter where. . . .
>
> All institutions in the modern world—whether scientific or lay—tend to pass into the hands of bureaucrats, or if not of bureaucrats into the control of those who measure up to one or more *external* standards of social polish, energetic manners, decisiveness, business acumen, and so on. All of these qualities, admirable as they are, give, in themselves, no advantage in piercing the secrets of Nature, or of directing the aims of the institution in harmony with the deepest needs of the society or with the eternal verities. Our contemporaries are content to hand over their destiny to those who, from the eminence of a Plato, a Christ, a Faraday, or a Shelley, are morally bankrupt (pp. 53-55).

He then points out specifically how scientific men have suffered at the hands of their contemporaries. Mendel, to whom is due the whole present science of genetics, died unrecognized and embittered. Gibbs, recognized twenty years too late for personal benefit, is in reality the founder of modern chemistry. Hitterorff and Ohm were recognized only at the end of their scientific lives. Sadi Carnot, largely the founder of the modern science of steam and gasoline engines, waited ten years to find a reader. The case of Mayer, an equally great discoverer in the same line, is striking. His papers were repeatedly refused, and when he finally achieved publication, he found himself regarded as an impostor because his ideas were already being used by later workers! A classic in this respect, not recognized by Dr. Watson, probably being too much even for him to credit, is the appropriation of the work and reputation of Béchamp by Pasteur.

Waterston's work, which largely founded the modern science of gases, was termed by a Royal Society referee "nothing but nonsense,

unfit even for reading before the Society." Newton's major books waited twenty years. Fourier's paper on heat was rejected by an Academy committee composed of Laplace, Lagrange, and Legendre, but thirteen years later, as secretary of the Academy, Fourier published the paper without change.

Such delays are not so common now, Dr. Watson remarks, pointing out some discoveries which were immediately heralded. But he adds:

> Yet these advances we have mentioned fitted neatly into the framework of existing institutions. They give answers to currently fashionable problems. A more revolutionary discovery, on the other hand, does not fit the existing set-up of accredited ideas. Its importance consists in the fact that there is no administrative niche waiting for it. It is not so easy to establish that contributions of this calibre do not face the same sort of obstacles as they did during the last century.
>
> For instance, it took many years before Einstein's special theory of relativity began to exert its profound influence on modern physics. . . . Again, I could tell you of an English physicist (Whyte) whose theoretical work may one day incorporate and transcend both the relativity and new quantum theories, but who is practically unknown to his fellow-physicists. I could introduce you to a biologist, an underling in a London hospital (Woodger), whose beautiful writings on theoretical biology are ignored by the great endowed laboratories, and to a cosmologist (Ross Gunn) whose brilliant new electromagnetic theory of the solar system is never mentioned when his predecessor, Jeans, is in the limelight. There is a designer of telescopes (Ritchey) who was not consulted about the construction of the mammoth new two-hundred-inch instrument at Mount Wilson, U. S. A. Yet this is rendered already out of date in many respects by his numerous improvements in technique and design (p. 59).

He gives other instances.

There is frequently a misleading allotment of credit for discovery. Freud's work, for instance, rests on that of Pierre Janet, and was anticipated by Schopenhauer. Ironically, the very feature that made the reputation of Freud—emphasis on sex—is not an improvement, as Watson points out, but a narrowing and stultification of Janet's work.

> The point is that through his wealth of case-data and through his commanding personality, Freud has come to be accepted as the symbol of the new psychology of the unconscious, both by the laity and by a majority of those doctors who devote themselves to psychological medicine. As a result, Pierre Janet, Adolf Meyer, and Hans Prinzhorn, who understand vast reaches of human nature that

> slip through the (somewhat pornographic) meshes of the Freudian scheme, are relatively unknown and do not exert their rightful weight in moulding the thought of the generation who are reading this book (p. 64).

This problem in science has been recognized by great minds but is kept in the background.

The *via dolorosa* of the true discoverer, as described by Dr. Watson, may be summed up as follows:

To begin with, having studied mainly under mediocre men who have gained their chairs in various ways not at all related to genius or real talent, the original mind will often find himself labeled "queer" by his teachers, with whom he has had frequent conflicts:

> He will be passed over in favour of rivals who show no sign of disturbing abnormality or originality. This rejection of outstanding talent is, in part, unintentional, since only the great can recognize the early signs of greatness in another (p. 67).

Having then reached the staff of a university or institution he comes in conflict with men who—

> . . . resent or ridicule the assumption that their own way of working and thinking is not the best way. Those who most hate to have potential distinction in their midst are those who are most active in the politics of the laboratory. Gradually a wall of unfavourable opinion is built around the newcomer.
>
> At length, however, this discrimination finds its way into the mind of the head of his department. From then on our potential discoverer finds that funds are not available for the piece of apparatus he needs so badly, that irritating routine jobs, dissipating his time and strength, are thrust upon him. Instead of being free to go on his own path, he is harnessed to the half-witted project of some "superior." He is appointed to committees which deal with side-issues or dead-issues. He is not appointed to committees which influence the trend of the research in the laboratories. He is passed over when a promotion or a rise in salary is being considered. Even the underlings of the establishment catch the idea. The librarian makes it difficult for him to get the books he so desperately needs, recalls them up to the letter of the law—in short, extends to him none of the privileges given to the men of standing who have played their political game successfully. When he tries to make a move to another university where he fancies he might get more scope, the same nemesis pursues him. He does not get the job. Finally, exasperated beyond measure, he tells some of these mediocrats what he thinks of them. This is just what they wanted. At the first opportunity he is dismissed "because he does not co-operate" or "because he disturbs the harmony of the institution" (pp. 68-9).

The chain of misfortune is most likely to be broken, if at all, by personal relationships rather than merit. That this situation is not imaginary is illustrated by the case of Einstein.

At last comes the stage of publishing a great discovery. If the paper is too revolutionary for the editor to understand, it is referred to "authorities" in the same field. Since the paper itself is evidence that said "authorities" have been overlooking something in their own specialty, the atmosphere is frigid from the beginning.

Then, very frequently, after being returned, the offending paper leaves its germinal ideas in the minds of the editor and the referees. There it blossoms out into new papers in which the credit due the original discoverer is minimized or does not appear at all. These authorities of course have prestige and control of all the channels. The excuses of the official plagiarist, when caught, run something like this:

> "The idea was in the air." . . . "Every scientist owes an infinite debt to the current climate of opinion." . . . "It is, strictly speaking, impossible to take another man's ideas, for, if they are new and original, only he himself can handle them successfully." . . . "The idea is as old as the hills. You will find it in Aristotle." . . . "A man who works in a very new field cannot expect to gain the rapid recognition open to those who work in close harmony with their contemporaries" . . . etc., etc.
>
> Thus the task of the scientific theorist who wishes to be recognized in his lifetime is as much a matter of weighing the likes, dislikes, prejudices, and intellectual honesty of office-holders as it is of questioning phenomena (p. 76).

During this discussion there forms a picture of the present scientific structure as closely resembling something much older. It is the delineation of a priesthood or hierarchal church. Every process which has been described is in principle as characteristic of a church as it is of science. With the Christian Church, a period of fresh thought and revelation, of almost ecstatic entry into new fields of spirit, gave slowly way to rigid crystallization in the interests of the personal positions of sectarian dignitaries. The modern world of science seems to be at the cross-roads of Constantine. Will discovery and originality continue to survive? Or will science in a few generations be devoted, on the one hand to enforcement and reiteration of dogmas which can no longer be questioned, and on the other, to rigidly utilitarian and materialistic applications?

The world is entering an era of new and tremendous import for mankind, and the future relationships between science, society, and Theosophy are of the utmost importance.

THE ADEPTS AND MODERN SCIENCE

[The tendency to compromise manifests wherever there are men who prefer the "security" of conventional beliefs to—in H. P. Blavatsky's challenging words—"looking popular prejudice straight in the face." Theosophists are endowed with the same human nature as other men, and hence it is that both H. P. B. and Wm. Q. Judge explicitly and repeatedly warned against compromise with any orthodoxy or ism at the expense of pure Theosophy. In this article, which first appeared in the *Path* for August, 1893, Mr. Judge brings together key statements of the Teachers on the relation of the Theosophical Movement to modern science. It exposes the materialistic foundations of scientific theory and the moral ineffectiveness of the applied sciences, showing how the path of true Theosophists differs from both. But out of this criticism comes also a suggestion of the sort of scientific thinking which deserves the encouragement of theosophists. This latter is illustrated in the "Science and the Secret Doctrine" study printed elsewhere in this issue.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

MODERN science is a bugbear for many a good Theosophist, causing him to hide his real opinions for fear they should conflict with science. But the latter is an unstable quantity, always shifting its ground, although never devoid of an overbearing assurance, even when it takes back what it had previously asserted. The views of scientific men have frequently been brought forward as a strong objection to the possibility of the existence of Adepts, Masters, Mahatmas, perfected men who have a complete knowledge of all that modern science is endeavoring to discover. Many trembling members of the Society, who do not doubt the Masters and their powers, would fain have those beings make their peace with science, so that the views of nature and man put forward by the Mahatmas might coincide with the ideas of modern investigators. It will be profitable to try to discover what is the attitude of the Adepts towards modern science.

The question was raised quite early in the history of the Society in the correspondence which Mr. Sinnett had with the Adept K. H. in India, and there is in the answers published by Mr. Sinnett in the *Occult World* enough to indicate clearly what is the attitude of such beings to modern science. That book will often have to be referred to in future years, because the letters given in its pages are valuable in more senses than has been thought; they ought to be studied by every member of the Society, and the ideas contained therein made a part of our mental furniture.

It is evident from the remarks made in the *Occult World* that the persons to whom the letters were written had a high respect for modern science; that they would have liked to see science convinced of the machinery of the occult Cosmos, with all that that implies; that they thought if modern scientific men could be convinced by extraordinary phenomena or otherwise about the Masters and Theosophy, very beneficial results to the Society would follow. There can be no doubt that if such a convincing were possible the results would have followed, but the hope of convincing our scientists seemed vain, because no way exists to alter the attitude of materialistic modern science except by a complete reform in its methods and theories. This would be a bringing back of ancient thought, and not agreeable to modern men. To pander in any way to science would be impossible to the Masters. They hold the position that if the rules and conclusions of nineteenth century science differ from those of the Lodge of the Brothers, then so much the worse for modern conclusions, as they must all be revised in the future. The radical difference between occult and modern materialistic science is that the former has philanthropy as its basis, whereas the latter has no such basis. Let us now see what can be discovered from the letters written by K. H. to Mr. Sinnett and another.

Mr. Sinnett writes, "The idea I had especially in my mind when I wrote the letter above referred to was that, of all tests of phenomena one could wish for, the best would be the production in our presence in India of a copy of the London *Times* of that day's date. With such a piece of evidence in my hand, I argued, I would undertake to convert everybody in Simla who was capable of linking two ideas together, to a belief in the possibility of obtaining by occult agency physical results which were beyond the control of modern science." To this he received a reply from K. H., who said: "Precisely because the test of the London newspaper would close the mouths of the sceptics it is inadmissible. See it in what light you will, the world is yet in its first stage of disenthralment, hence unprepared. . . . But as on the one hand science would find itself unable in its present state to account for the wonders given in its name, and on the other the ignorant masses would still be left to view the phenomenon in the light of a miracle, every one who would be thus made a witness to the occurrence would be thrown off his balance and the result would be deplorable." In this is the first indication of the philanthropic basis, although later it is definitely stated. For here we see that the Adepts would not do that which might result in the mental confusion of so many persons as are included in "ignorant masses." He then goes on

to say: "Were we to accede to your desires, know you really what consequence would follow in the trail of success? The inexorable shadow which follows all human innovations moves on, yet few are they who are ever conscious of its approach and dangers. What are they then to expect who would offer to the world an innovation which, owing to human ignorance, if believed in will surely be attributed to those dark agencies that two-thirds of humanity believe in and dread as yet?"

Here again we see that Adepts will not do that which, however agreeable to science, extraordinary and interesting in itself, might result in causing the masses once more to consider that they had proof of the agency of devils or other dreaded unseen beings. The object of the Adepts being to increase the knowledge of the greater number and to destroy dogmatism with superstition, they will not do that which would in any way tend to defeat what they have in view. In the letter quoted from, the Adept then goes on to show that the number of persons free from ignorant prejudice and religious bigotry is still very small. It is very true that such an extraordinary thing as the production of the *Times* in India across several thousand miles of ocean might convince even hundreds of scientific men of the possibility of this being done by a knowledge of law, but their belief would have but little effect on the immense masses of uneducated persons in the West who are still bound up in religious bigotry and prejudice. The Adept hints that "the inexorable shadow that follows all human innovations" would be a sudden blazing forth again of ignorant superstition among the masses, which, gaining force, and sweeping all other men along in the immense current thus generated, the very purpose of the phenomenon would then be negatived. On this the Adept writes a little further on, "As for human nature in general, it is the same now as it was a million years ago, prejudice based upon selfishness, a general unwillingness to give up an established order of things for new modes of life and thought—and occult study requires all that and much more—proud and stubborn resistance to truth if it but upsets the previous notion of things: such are the characteristics of the age." "However successful, the danger would be growing proportionately with success," that is, the danger would grow in proportion to the success of the phenomenon produced. "No choice would soon remain but to go on, ever crescendo, or to fall, in this endless struggle with prejudice and ignorance, killed by your own weapons. Test after test would be required and would have to be furnished; every subsequent phenomenon expected to be more marvelous than the preceding one. Your daily remark is that one

cannot be expected to believe unless he becomes an eye-witness. Would the lifetime of a man suffice to satisfy the whole world of sceptics? . . . In common with many you blame us for our great secrecy. Yet we know something of human nature, for the experience of long centuries, aye of ages, has taught us. And we know that so long as science has anything to learn, and a shadow of religious dogmatism lingers in the hearts of the multitudes, the world's prejudices have to be conquered step by step, not at a rush." These simple remarks are philosophical, historically accurate, and perfectly true. All spiritualistic mediums know that their visitors require test after test. Even the dabbler in psychic matters is aware that his audience or his friends require a constant increase of phenomena and results, and every earnest student of occultism is aware of the fact that in his own circle there are fifty unbelievers to one believer, and that the believers require that they shall see the same thing over again that others report.

Proceeding with this matter to another letter, the Adept says: "We will be at cross purposes in our correspondence until it has been made entirely plain that occult science has its own methods of research as fixed and arbitrary as the methods of its antithesis, physical science, are in their way. If the latter has its *dicta,* so also has the former." He then goes on to show that the person desiring to know their science must abide by their rules, and taking his correspondent as an illustration, he says: "You seek all this, and yet, as you say yourself, hitherto you have not found sufficient reasons to even give up your modes of life, directly hostile to such communication." This means of course that scientific men as well as other inquirers must conform to the rules of occult science if they wish to know it, and must themselves change their modes of thought and action. He then goes on to analyze the motives of his correspondent, and these motives would be the same as those impelling science to investigate. They are described to be the desire to have positive proofs of forces in nature unknown to science, the hope to appropriate them, the wish to demonstrate their existence to some others in the West, the ability to contemplate future life as an objective reality built upon knowledge and not faith, and to learn the truth about the Lodge and the Brothers. These motives, he says, are selfish from the standpoint of the Adepts, and this again emphasizes the philanthropy behind occult science. The motives are selfish because, as he says, "The highest aspirations for the welfare of humanity become tainted with selfishness if in the mind of the philanthropist there lurks a shadow of a desire for self-benefit, or a tendency to do injustice, even where these exist

unconsciously to himself. Yet you have ever discussed but to put down the idea of a universal brotherhood, questioned its usefulness, and advised to remodel the Theosophical Society on the principle of a college for the special study of occultism."

The Adept makes it very clear that such a proposition could not be entertained, showing once more that Brotherhood, and not the study of secret laws of nature, is the real object the inner Lodge has in view. Brotherhood as an object is the highest philanthropy, and especially so when connected with science.

In another letter, written after consultation with much higher Adepts, who have never been mentioned and who are utterly unknown even to Theosophists, being too high to be encountered, he takes up the same subject, saying, "In conformity with exact science you define but one cosmic energy, and see no difference between the energy expended by the traveller who pushes aside the bush that obstructs his path and the scientific experimenter who expends an equal amount of energy in setting a pendulum in motion. We do; for we know there is a world of difference between the two. The one uselessly dissipates and scatters force; the other concentrates and stores it; and here please understand that I do not refer to the relative utility of the two, as one might imagine, but only to the fact that in the one case there is brute force flung out without any transmutation of that brute energy into the higher potential form of spiritual dynamics, and in the other there is just that. . . . Now for us poor unknown philanthropists no fact of either of these sciences is interesting except in the degree of its potentiality for moral results, and in the ratio of its usefulness to mankind. And what, in its proud isolation, can be more utterly indifferent to everyone and everything, or more bound to nothing but the selfish requisites for its advancement, than this materialistic science of fact? May I ask, then, what have the laws of Faraday, Tyndall, or others to do with philanthropy in their abstract relations with humanity, viewed as an intelligent whole? What care they for man as an isolated atom of this great and harmonious whole, even though they may be sometimes of practical use to him? Cosmic energy is something eternal and incessant; matter is indestructible: and there stand the scientific facts. Doubt them and you are an ignoramus; deny them, a dangerous lunatic, a bigot; pretend to improve upon the theories, an impertinent charlatan. And yet even these scientific facts never suggested any proof to the world of experimenters that nature consciously prefers that matter should be indestructible under organic rather than inorganic forms, and that she works slowly but incessantly towards the realization of this object—the evolution of conscious life out of unconscious

material. . . . Still less does exact science perceive that while the building ant, the busy bee, the nidifacient bird, accumulates each in its own humble way as much cosmic energy in its potential form as a Hayden, a Plato, or a ploughman turning his furrow. . . . The hunter who kills game for his pleasure or profit, the positivist who applies his intellect to proving that *plus* multiplied by *plus* equals *minus*, are wasting and scattering energy no less than the tiger which springs upon its prey. They all rob nature instead of enriching her, and will all in the degree of their intelligence find themselves accountable. . . . Exact experimental science has nothing to do with morality, virtue, philanthropy—therefore can make no claim upon our help until it blends itself with metaphysics. Being a cold classification of facts outside of man, and existing before and after him, her domain of usefulness ceases for us at the outer boundary of these facts; and whatever the inferences and results for humanity from the materials acquired by her method, she little cares. Therefore as our sphere lies entirely outside of hers,—as far as the path of Uranus is outside the earth's,—we distinctly refuse to be broken on any wheel of her construction. . . . The truths and mysteries of Occultism constitute, indeed, a body of the highest spiritual importance, at once profound and practical for the world at-large, yet it is not as an addition to the tangled mass of theory or speculation that they are being given to you, but for their practical bearing on the interests of mankind."

We have in these extracts a clear outline of the exact position of the Adepts towards modern science, together with the statement of the reasons why they do not come forth by astounding phenomena to convince the world of their existence. The reason for the refusal is that the world is not ready, but is in such a condition that the end would be obstructed and damage be the result. Their attitude to modern science is that they accept the facts of science wherever they prove the truths of Occultism, but they consider modern science to be materialistic and also devoid of philanthropy. This we must admit to be the case, and as the student who has had experience in these matters knows for himself that the Adepts have the truth and possess a knowledge of nature's laws, he approves of their refusing to come down to science and of their demand that science must rise to them. He also knows that in the course of the cycles the mass of men will have been educated and developed to such a position that a new school, at once religious and scientific, will have possession of the earth and rule among all men who possess civilization.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

WELL, George, what did you think of your second visit to our study class?" inquired Gail as soon as the group had settled itself in the living room.

"All I can say is that Arjuna certainly knew what he was talking about when he said that the mind is as hard to restrain as the winds," replied George, in a rather dejected tone.

"What do you mean by that?" asked Gail.

"Just that I've about given up trying to keep my mind on what is being said," George explained. "In the midst of a discussion of some deep and perplexing question, the craziest kind of thoughts enter my head—such as what a wonderful time I had at the game last week, or how I can hardly wait for the Christmas vacation. After a few minutes I wake up, realize I have been a hundred miles away, kick myself mentally, and try to pick up the drift of the discussion—but before I know it I'm off again. I'm just about ready to quit. Does anyone ever reach that fixity of mind that Krishna talks about? It seems like a hopeless proposition to me."

"You're not the only one who suffers from that particular affliction, George," said Janice. "Lots of times, especially in my economics class, where the professor drones on by the hour about some dull subject, I find myself making mental pictures of the sun and the waves and the sand at the beach. Wonder what it is that makes it so easy to day-dream about the pleasant sensations we have had or would like to have, rather than the deeper and more philosophical things of life?"

"Don't you think one of the main reasons," suggested Max, "is that it takes so little energy to think about merely pleasant things? It takes real will-action to keep our minds on, for instance, the philosophical matter at hand, and to devote our whole attention to it."

"Another point to be considered is that those passive and reflective thoughts are primarily of the lower, personal man, and in the majority of cases that is the part of us that absorbs our attention," ventured Alayne.

"Do you remember that quotation from *The Voice of the Silence: Thou shalt not let thy senses make a playground of thy mind?* When we get to thinking about it we realize just how big a playground most of us have let our minds become. It takes plenty of will power to turn our heads into a workshop for creative thought," said Gail.

"What are you smiling about, Alayne?" asked Janice. "You look as if a most amusing notion had just entered your head."

"I was thinking that what we teach the babies in Theosophy School is right in line with what we have been talking about," answered Alayne. "We tell them that our minds are our thought-gardens, and that we have to plant the right and highest kind of thought-seeds there, for if we don't, the black weeds will grow, and pretty soon there will be little room left for our good thoughts. The weeds grow fast and use up our energy, and it becomes harder and harder to pull them out."

"There's no doubt about it—the control of the mind is one of the hardest things to achieve," contributed King. "As Alayne said, it is all tied up with the personality, and our fight with this part of our nature, trying to gain mastery over it, is the toughest fight any of us encounters."

"The whole struggle with the personal man was brought home to me when I got to thinking of it from the standpoint of a man running a machine," Martinez added. "To have our own 'machine' run perfectly we have to control every part of our nature, understanding each part for what it is, and realizing its function. No one part should dominate the rest, but all work together in harmony. Our mind is just one of the things we have to get under our thumb. Control of speech is also hard, but if we begin with control of thoughts, right speech will inevitably follow."

"And the control of the mind and speech takes will power," King took it up. "We are *will* beings, and we have to develop our will along right lines. We have become so engrossed in the life of the senses that our highest will has been buried; it is only through bringing out our will and putting it into action, that we can finally get control of our bodies, actions, and thoughts. Then each part of our nature will fall into its correct place."

"I agree with you. That's all straight stuff, but still just how are we to go about all this control, and development of the will?" asked George.

"Yes," said Gail, "going back to the original question, what do we do to get our minds in that steadfast position? Gaining complete power over our natures seems to me, at least, to be such a long and difficult proposition—wouldn't it take thousands of incarnations?"

"Naturally it can't be done over night," was Max's reply. "But it will never be accomplished unless we begin. If we start now making our minds stick to the subject at hand, not go jumping from here to

there, the task will gradually get easier and easier, and some day we will have that concentration we are talking about."

"Yes," chimed in Martinez. "In *The Friendly Philosopher,* Mr. Crosbie said that what moves the 'mind' this way or that is usually desire for the attractions of matter, and self-interest in them, and that these move and control the mind through the brain. It seems to me that if our desires were unselfish we wouldn't have to worry so much about not being able to keep our minds steadfast, as our thoughts arising from these high desires would be of the right kind, and the control we spoke of would come of itself."

"It also says in the teachings," said King, "that the want of concentration of thought is due to the fact that the mind is subject to constant modifications, by reason of its being diffused over a great number of subjects. If we wish to correct this tendency, which we all have to a greater or lesser extent, we are advised to obtain *one-pointedness,* the power to apply the mind, at any moment, to the consideration of a single point of thought, to the exclusion of all else. We know that the mind is not the supreme power, as it is only a function, an instrument, with which the soul works, feels and experiences. It has a plane of its own, distinct from the soul and the brain. What we have to learn is how to use the will to prevent the mind turning from one subject or object to another as the senses may move it, and start to apply it, as we would a servant, to one specific task."

"Following out what you have said, King," went on Janice, "to acquire concentration, we must, again and again, make efforts to obtain such control over our minds that we can, any time it is necessary, reduce the mind to an unmoved condition or apply it to any one point to the exclusion of all others."

"That's the way it would seem," answered King. "I grant you that it's a long process, but it gets easier and easier as we go along."

"Good night!" exclaimed George jumping up from his chair, "I got so absorbed in what we were talking about I forgot to look at the time, and Dad said I had to be home by eleven!" He put on his coat and started for the door. Then he turned to the group. "May I come next week, if I promise to keep my mind on what you talk about?"

"Come anyway," laughed King. "Aren't we all in the same boat?"

An understanding of this doctrine of man being really a thinker and made of thought will make clear all the rest in relation to incarnation and reincarnation. —W. Q. J.

"POSEIDON OF THE SEA"

Up from Aegean caverns, pool by pool
Of blue salt sea, where feet most beautiful
Of Nereid maidens weave beneath the foam
Their long sea-dances, I, their lord, am come,
Poseidon of the Sea.

—*Euripides.*

MANY a secret of the watery deep hovers nigh the figure of Poseidon, called by the profane, Neptune. Plato suggests as much in his tale of submerged Atlantis. But he could give only hints. It is to the grand gods of India we must turn to find not merely the fate of one lost land, but also the cosmic symbology of Poseidon's oceanic kingdom. The universal glory of Aryan deities we see dimly reflected in the Greek immortals. The identity of the Greek gods with the Hindu sacred pantheon, and the cosmogonies of other nations, must be admitted at the start.

"The fables of the mythopoeic ages will be found to have but allegorized the greatest truths of geology and anthropology" (*Isis*, I, 122). These truths of geology and anthropology are revealed by a study of Poseidon, and, wrote H. P. Blavatsky, it is in these fables "that science will have to look for her 'missing links'."

The Atlantes (those people of Western Africa who dwelt near Mount Atlas) claimed Uranos for the first king, and the fact—

> that Plato commences his story of Atlantis by the division of the great continent by Neptune, the grandson of Uranos, shows that there were continents and kings before Atlantis. For Neptune, to whose lot that continent fell, finds on a small island only one human couple made of clay (*i.e.*, the first physical *human* man, whose origin began with the last sub-races of the Third Root-Race). It is their daughter Clito that the god marries, and it is his eldest son *Atlas* who receives for his part the mountain and the continent which was called by his name. . . .
>
> Thus while Uranos (or the host representing this celestial group) reigned and ruled over the Second Race and their (then) Continent; . . . others fought in the allegory for Atlantis, which was the whole earth in the day of the Fourth Race (*S. D.* II, 765).

The genealogy of these gods would lead the intuitive scientist back to the Second Race of Theosophical anthropology. Only on Atlantis, the fourth continent, did man's body become actually physical. Before that it was astral, the plane where the "missing link" in man's evolution can alone be found.

> Poseidonis, or the (last) island of Atlantis "the third step of Idaspati" (or Vishnu) in the mystic language of the secret books—lasted till about 12,000 years ago. The Atlantes of Diodorus were

> right in claiming that it was their country, the region surrounding Mount Atlas, where "the gods were born"—*i.e.*, "incarnated." But it was after their fourth incarnation that they became, for the first time, human Kings and rulers (*S. D.* II, 765).

Neptune divided Atlantis between his ten sons. In the Hindu Puranas, which give a description of wars on continents and islands situated beyond Western Africa in the Atlantic ocean, the division of the earth was made by Medhatithi, who also had ten sons. One of the sons had the extremity of Atlantis as his portion (probably the old continent, part of Lemuria). This Atlantis was overwhelmed by the flood. The Atlantis of those times included the entire antediluvian earth which the ten princes were born to rule over, according to Western as well as Eastern mythology. But *seven* only sat upon the throne, and of the seven dwipas, or islands, six were destroyed by a flood (*S. D.* II, 406).

Many take Atlantis to be Gades, the ancient area about and including Spain, but, H. P. B. says (*S. D.* II, 406 fn.), "it was Plato's island—rather."

Plato describes Poseidon's own temple:

> All the outside of the temple, with the exception of the pinnacles, they covered with silver, and the pinnacles with gold. . . . In the temple they placed statues of gold—there was the god himself standing in a chariot—the charioteer of six winged horses—and of such a size that he touched the roof of the building with his head; around him there were a hundred Nereids riding on dolphins, for such was thought to be the number of them in that day. (*Critias.*)

What is the meaning of these horses, dolphins and fair Nereids that surrounded the mighty statue which stood in the sacred, central temple on Atlantis? Are they mere servants, a dashing train of sea-folk which ancient fantasy placed in attendance upon Poseidon?

Homer makes Poseidon the God of the Horse. He created the horse and was the patron of horse races. Plato tells us of gardens and places of exercise for horses on Atlantis, of a race-course which extended all around the largest island zone. Poseidon's own horses had brazen hoofs and golden manes. They drew his chariot over the sea, which became smooth before him, while the monsters of the deep gamboled about his path. Poseidon assumed the form of the horse himself to please Ceres. "Arion, their progeny, is one of the aspects of that 'horse,' which is a cycle." (*S. D.* II, 399 fn.) In this connection it is to be remembered that the eternal ebb and flow of the ocean tides is governed by cycle, as well as the cataclysmic convulsions of flood and fire that usher in a new race and continent. Poseidon, it is said, made watery gates to imprison the three polar giants, who

represent the polar lands, which though convulsed from time to time still remain, confined by the polar sea. The horse, says H. P. B., has an occult primitive meaning. In India, it is used as a symbol for a Rishi, but here it applies to the cyclic birth and death of continents.

The Dolphin was the vehicle of Poseidon-Neptune with the Greeks, and one with him, esoterically; and this "dolphin" is the "sea-dragon," says the *Secret Doctrine.* Under the form of a dolphin Poseidon won the Nereid, Amphitrite, for his wife; their son, Triton, had the body of a man above the waist, and below, that of a dolphin, or a fish. "The Dolphin, as every mythologist knows, was placed for his service by Poseidon among the constellations, and became with the Greeks, *Capricornus,* the goat, whose hind part is that of a dolphin. . . ." (*S. D.* II, 578.) Amphitrite is an early form of Venus (*S. D.* II, 578) and goats were sacrificed to her and the Nereids on the seashore, just as goats were sacrificed to Lakshmi, the Venus of India.

Triton is mysteriously connected with Oannes, the Babylonian Dagon, or manfish, and also with the (fish) Avatar of Vishnu, both teaching mortals *Wisdom.*

Nereus was father of the Nereid maidens, and, wrote H. P. B., "Poseidon and Nereus *are one.*" Perhaps it is because of this identity that Homer never names Nereus, whose name we arrive at only through the patronymic of the Nereids. Poseidon is the ruler or spirit of Atlantis before the beginning of its submersion, and Nereus, after. "Neptune is the titantic strength of the *living* race; Nereus, its spirit reincarnated in the subsequent Fifth or Aryan Race. . . " (II, 766.)

Proteus, like Triton, was another water deity who was the son of Neptune. He, like Nereus, is styled a sea-elder for his wisdom and knowledge of future events. Proteus, "the old man of the sea," could live on land as well as in the water, or in the air as easily as on land. He represents a type of that wise being who lived near the Sacred Lake, where the gods ever dwell. He could change his form at will, and if one were trying to pursue him, he would slip away by transforming himself into another appearance; perhaps into a dreadful beast, or into fire, or flood. It may be he is called a water-god because water will take the form of any vessel into which it is poured.

Proteus had also the gift of prophecy, as would be expected of one who could enter any form at will, or go into whatsoever element he wished. Water, too, is a mirror which reflects all things; so, if he could look over in it all that had been, he could easily tell what might come to be.

One day a man made up his mind to catch Proteus and find out what he really was. At this time, the god was sleeping heavily as a stone, but as soon as touched, he woke and turned himself into a plant. The man was just about to pull up the plant, when, lo! a serpent coiled at his feet, and when he sought to kill the snake, a man stood laughing in his face. But in a trice, the man melted into thin air and a fierce gale blew, after which, a lightning-flash, by which the outline of a wondrous spirit could be traced, mounting ever higher until it was lost in the starry spaces of the sky. Can we not see that herein the great universal Proteus—Life—is described, in its journey of evolution through the lower kingdoms up to man, and then, to gods, with power over all the forces of nature?

How widespread and how old is the worship of Poseidon? Far wider and older than we might think, for H. P. Blavatsky has said, "the pictures on the walls [of the Nagkon-Wat] may be proved to belong to those archaic ages when Poseidon and the Kabeiri were worshipped throughout the continent" (*Isis*, I, 565). "And do we not know," writes Ragon, the "illustrious and learned" Belgian Mason, "that the ancient *initiated* poets, when speaking *of the foundation of a city,* meant thereby the *establishment of a doctrine?* Thus *Neptune,* the god of reasoning, and *Apollo,* the god of the *hidden* things, presented themselves as masons before Laomedon, Priam's father, to help him to build the city of Troy—that is to say, to establish the Trojan religion." (*S. D.* II, 795-6.)

Seven meanings, from cosmic powers down to earthly man, were wrapped up in the gods of Greece and India. The knowledge of how to discern among these forms the one that is meant, belonged at all times to the Initiates, whose earliest predecessors had created this symbolic and allegorical system. In Poseidon we see a mysterious admixture of the divine and earthly which is unraveled only by turning the seven-fold key as an explanation of the following:

> Poseidon "is indeed essentially of the earth earthy . . . strong and self-asserting, sensual and intensely jealous and vindictive,"—but this is because he symbolises the Spirit of the Fourth Root-Race, the ruler of the Seas, that race which lives above the surface of the seas, which is composed of the giants, the children of Eurymedon, the race which is the father of Polyphemus, the Titan and *one-eyed* Cyclops.
> (*S. D.* II, 766.)

The children of Eurymedon were the descendants of the Third Race Titans, one of the last sub-races of which is represented by Polyphemus, called the "one-eyed" Cyclops, referring to the Wisdom-eye of the Lemurians.

Though Zeus reigns over the Fourth Race, it is Poseidon who rules and is the true key to our *human* races. "What is the meaning of Poseidon's amours under such a variety of *animal* forms? He became a dolphin to win Amphitrite; a horse, to seduce Ceres; a ram, to deceive Theophane, etc., etc. Poseidon is not only the personation of the Spirit and Race of Atlantis, but also of the vices of these giants" (*S. D.* II, 775).

So much for the dark side. The reverse is bright indeed. "Poseidon is a 'Dragon' " (*S. D.* II, 356), and in its most terrestrial meaning the term "Dragon" was applied to *Wise* men. Poseidon was, as said, called Neptune by the profane, and Neptune is the symbol of Atlantean magic. Surely, the trident fashioned for him by Vulcan, which he bore as scepter, was a fitting symbol of his power!

Neptune or Poseidon is the Hindu *Idaspati,* meaning, "master of the waters," and is also identical with Vishnu. Like Vishnu, Poseidon is shown crossing the whole horizon in three steps, a reference to the successive subsidence of the Second, Third, and Fourth Continents. He is Narayana, who, like Poseidon, moved or dwelt *over* not under the waters, and he is the Hindu Varuna. Do not these many Hindu gods represented by one Greek god, show how vastly detailed and scientific was the language and religion of ancient India? H. P. Blavatsky explains in reference to Varuna: "From the 'Waters of Space,' the progeny of the male Spirit-Fire and the female (gaseous) Water has become the Oceanic expanse on Earth. Varuna is dragged down from the infinite Space, to reign as Neptune over the finite Seas. As always, the popular fancy is found to be based on a strictly scientific foundation" (*S. D.* II, 65).

But the most abstruse aspect of Poseidon is found in his five mystic ministers, symbolized both in the dolphin and Triton. They are the five-fold Chohans, called in India, *Kumara,* and connected with Makara, or Capricornus—five because the last two names have ever been kept secret. (*S. D.* II, 578.) The soul of the five elements is in them, Water and Ether predominating, therefore their symbols were both aquatic and fiery—an echo of the geologic truth that continents perish alternately by fire and water! (*S. D.* II, 776 fn.)

Just as Amphitrite was the mother of Neptune's ministers, so in India, Savarana, the daughter of the ocean, was the mother of the five "Prachetas," as they are called in Sanskrit, who plunged into the depths of the ocean for their devotions. Turning now to the fiery (or Ether) aspect, the Hindu sign of Capricornus, the Makara, was borne on the banner of Kamadeva, the Hindu god of love, the son of Lakshmi, who is one with Venus. This Kama is the Unborn, the

self-existent, the Desire which "first arose in IT, which was the primal germ of mind." Of the creations resulting from that desire, the Kumara appear in the fifth. After these considerations H. P. B. says, "Let us note one more thing in relation to the mysterious number five. It symbolizes at one and the same time the Spirit of life eternal and the Spirit of life and love terrestrial—in the human compound; and, it includes divine and infernal magic. . ." (*S. D.* II, 579.)

The divine magic (or following the dictates of conscience) and the infernal magic (the power of personal desire), are still practiced by the Atlantean egos, now incarnated in Western lands, and "The development of the American nation has a mysterious but potent connection with the wonderful past of the Atlanteans," wrote Mr. Judge in the *Echoes* (p. 19). The dualism of the god Poseidon presents again the age-old problem we faced in Atlantean bodies, for he is the Spirit of the fourth Root Race. We have the choice between the strong, self-asserting, intensely jealous and vindictive *Poseidon* in ourselves, or—the "Dragon" of Wisdom.

"Much Ado About Nothing"

The evils to which human life is prone are not really abolished by violent changes in political and social systems, and in the places of those which may be so eradicated new and often worse evils appear. Hence our happiness is less dependent upon external forms of social organization than upon the advancement of knowledge and the prevalence of the spirit of culture and good will among mankind. Almost any social system could be made to work satisfactorily by good men. None will bring general happiness under the leadership of ignorant, opinionated, grasping men. Reading of history almost convinces one who has any psychological insight that most of the fuss about social reconstruction is much ado about nothing. Where change is necessary and remedy is apparent, modification of political and economic forms takes place gradually and with little resistance. But the idea that all social evils have but one neck which may be severed by one mighty blow of righteous popular indignation should long ago have been relegated to the realm of myth and fable.

—Everett Dean Martin.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Science, Philosophy and Religion

The Third Annual Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life met at Columbia University in the last five days of August, and the findings of the hundred scholars who gathered to compare notes are heartening evidence of that "age of inquiry" seen by Mr. Judge half a century ago. (The two previous conferences were reported in Lookout for Nov., 1940, and Jan., 1942, respectively.) The preliminary statement of the Conference set the keynote:

> We will have to discover how the ethics and spiritual principles by which we live are related to the rest of our thought. . . . The time has come when we must make a determined effort to discover the nature of the kinship between these various disciplines and modern democracy. . . .
>
> A great war is not only a great disaster; it also presents a great opportunity. Widespread destruction and suffering are inevitable; the problem confronting intelligent men and women is to prevent this destruction and suffering from being futile. . . . The opportunity for making a lasting contribution to world peace and happiness, as well as to man's spiritual advancement, is very great. (New York *Times,* Aug. 28.)

"The Scholar's Obscurantism"

The knowledge and wisdom of scholars must be made intelligible to the public if they are to influence democratic action, declared Professor Lyman Bryson, on leave from Teachers College, Columbia, to serve as educational director of the Columbia Broadcasting System and the Office of War Information. Addressing the fourth session of the conference, Prof. Bryson said:

> In this war and in the peace to follow, the people should have access to the real issues as they did not last time. . . . One thing, however, may prevent the organized wisdom and scientific knowledge which we have—and which we had twenty years ago—from being brought to bear this time. It may fail to affect government policy because of the deliberate obscurantism of the scholar. Too often he has sought to impress rather than to enlighten. The wisdom which he has secreted has been allowed to seep only slowly into practical use.
>
> Let us make no mistake. The reconstruction of the world is going to be a matter of tremendous pressure. It can't wait for seeping wisdom. When we enter at last into an armistice, it will mean a

long period of international and social policing all over the world, which will not be a time of peaceful discussion between peoples. That is a most dangerous illusion. . . .

"A Scientific Problem"

One of the most astonishing discoveries I have ever made in my own life is that in all the long history of the relations of policy makers in action and men of thought, no one has ever studied the methods of connecting thought with action.

Or if there is a treatise on the subject, I have found no one who knows of it. I think you had better get busy on the problem. It is a scientific problem. (New York *Times,* Aug. 31.)

Evidently none of the standard Theosophical books, not one article by either H. P. Blavatsky or William Q. Judge, never a single issue of *The Theosophist, Lucifer, The Path,* or, for that matter, of the Magazine THEOSOPHY, has ever found its way into the Professor's hands; nor has any Theosophical meeting ever attracted his attention.

Reprinted in this issue, for instance, is Mr. Judge's "Adepts and Modern Science," in which not only the method of connecting "thought" and "action," or science and metaphysics, is studied, but the synthesis of the two—philosophical philanthropy, if you like—is presented. Not less than nine statements scattered through the article point to the identity of true philosophy with ethical action. Two statements in particular, one by W. Q. J. himself, and the other quoted from the Adept, should be especially noted:

Brotherhood as an object is the highest philanthropy, and especially so when connected with science. . . .

"Now for us poor unknown philanthropists no fact of either of these sciences is interesting except in the degree of its potentiality for moral results, and in the ratio of its usefulness to mankind."

"Still Far Away"

Two political scientists, a historian, a chemist, a philosopher and an authority on English literature, all faculty members of Hunter College, presented a paper representing their combined thought on "Human Liberty in a Universe of Reason and Order," in which the following occurs:

The universal brotherhood of man is still far away. It would seem to require a more equitable distribution of wealth among nations as well as among individuals. . . . As energy and matter tend to flow from a region of higher concentration for a lower level, so with the wealth representing the natural resources and labor of our country. (New York *Times,* Aug. 31.)

As to the notion that the artificial distribution of wealth, *before* brotherhood has been made a living fact in the life of each man, is either realistic or possible, we refer the reader to pages 558 and 571 in the October issue. And we suggest, following out the simile quoted above, that if matter and material possessions tend to flow from a region of higher concentration to a lower level, dissipating themselves to cover a broader base, so to say, spiritual resources and the wealth of mind should tend to rise and approximate unity on a higher level. For as light converged on a single lens is evenly distributed after passing through the focus, so would the light of many minds, if concentrated on the single high object—universal brotherhood or philanthropy—bring equal distribution of all the world's bounty.

"THE FIRST STEP TOWARD THERAPY"

Upon adjourning their five-day session, the conferees issued a formal statement (New York *Times*, Sept. 1):

> The rise to totalitarianism and its challenge to the civilized world are inherent neither in the world process nor in human nature. The tragedy of our time might have been avoided, and its worst consequences can still be escaped, through bringing into focus the spiritual and intellectual resources available to us . . . deterioration of standards of thought and action affected society in its most sensitive aspects—namely, the fields of art, letters, philosophy and thought—long before the advent of the war.
>
> Realization that the malady menacing our civilization is both intellectual and spiritual is the first step toward therapy. . . .

Or, as the theosophist puts it, what is needed, and "what the theosophical philosophy is intended for," is a change in the Buddhi-Manas —the motivating intelligence—of the race.

APPALLING TASKS

> To bring our tremendous spiritual and intellectual resources, with their enormous accumulation of data and their widely differing methodologies of study into any recognized relationship with one another, and to focus their wealth of ideas and inspiration both on the immediate goals to be achieved in our time and the ultimate goals toward which we must strive, are tasks appalling in their immensity.

Paraphrasing a statement of Mr. Judge's (THEOSOPHY xxx, 100), we might say, If only the scholar would pay a little more attention to the ancients, he would save himself a great deal of trouble, for he obtains his knowledge by much delving, much painstaking labor, whereas he might have gotten the knowledge by consulting the an-

cients. Why spend lifetimes counting the pebbles and weighing the sand on the shores of life, when by learning a few fundamental principles we could navigate the "ocean"?

Unifying Knowledge

One outstanding result of the three annual conferences is the great step taken in unifying the many branches of knowledge: "Each year has witnessed a clearer approach to common thinking on the basic problems of the day." At the 1942 session the proposal was made for the evolution of a new technique of discussion, which may well be the "good discourse" recommended and exemplified by Bronson Alcott a century ago (see Theosophy xxx, 177, and "Theosophist Unaware" in June and July issues). This new technique should—

> approach a scholastic interchange of thought looking to mutual enlightenment rather than frustration. . . .
>
> Much is learned by scholars and men of letters in formal discussion; infinitely more in informal conversation. This is true of the most subtle and the methodological aspects of their work, the results of which must be expressed in concrete and intelligible form. There is need therefore to arrange, as soon as world conditions permit, for groups of scholars to meet with one another over considerable periods, perhaps spending their vacations together so that they may learn to think together.

"To Help and Teach Others"

Interesting evidence of the law of brotherhood in special reference to education as well as evolution is another passage:

> It is probable that in the last analysis all formulated human learning arose from the need of making it articulate to students. Scholars and men of affairs may meet for mutual discussion and enlightenment with great profit. But the attainment of clarity among themselves and in their relationship to the world will be reached when they have to join in guiding a student.

In other words, knowledge is really ours only when we can give it to others, and our evolution is actually accomplished only by helping others on with theirs.

"A Modest Program"

The conference decided that "ultimate solution of the problem presented will await the creation of a series of fellowships . . . in the fields covered by this conference." In conclusion is said:

> This may seem an ambitious program for this conference. But to those who recognize the vastness of the problem and its urgency, the program will seem modest indeed. So modest is this program that

> little could be expected to come out of it except for the widespread recognition on the part of us all and many others that the intellectual and spiritual impediments preventing mankind from creating a durable civilization and a peaceful world must be removed, and that this removal is the task of scholarship cooperating with experience.

The scholars have put their collective finger on the sorest spot in modern learning,—divorce of principles from conduct.

In a statement to the press the representatives of the conference remarked that men of affairs are "men who do their thinking with a view to action," whereas scholars are "men who do their thinking for the sake of teaching or knowing." Next year, therefore, "men of affairs" will be invited to participate in the conference. If from further meeting of minds comes perception of a sure and sound basis for thought *and* action, at once scientific, philosophical and religious, the conferences will not have been in vain. Such work goes a long way toward helping the race over its *transition* point.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Concluding his article on "Theosophy and Capital Punishment" first printed in 1895, Wm. Q. Judge wrote:

> The Theosophist who believes in the multiple nature of man and in the complexity of his inner nature, and knows that that is governed by law and not by mere chance or by the fancy of those who prate of the need for protecting society when they do not know the right way to do it, relying only on the punitive and retaliatory Mosaic law—will oppose capital punishment. He sees it is unjust to the living, a danger to the state, and that it allows no chance whatever for any reformation of the criminal (THEOSOPHY III, 570).

What to a theosophist would be a "karmic indication," but which to a "state" of ignorance of the laws of Karma and Reincarnation may not indicate much more than a miscarriage of justice, occurred in California recently. We quote the dispatch in the Los Angeles *Times* (Oct. 1) in its entirety:

> Sacramento, Sept. 30. (AP)—Leroy Haley, 32, Sacramento law clerk, has served 21 months in San Quentin Prison for crimes which he did not commit and should be pardoned, the State Advisory Board declared today.
>
> Acting on the report of C. H. Stone, chief of the State Bureau of Criminal Identification, the board recommended that Governor Olson pardon Haley and that efforts be made to try Wesley McDonough, 27, Sacramento, on the charges on which Haley was convicted last year.
>
> Haley was sentenced to three life terms in prison after a jury convicted him on Jan. 10, 1941, of 12 counts of mayhem, kidnapping and robbery.

It is comparatively easy to commute a life term, or three life terms, as in this case. Though great injustice has been done, the misjudgment did not cut off the normal life-term of an immortal Soul. Nor did it generate an evil current of thought which would provide other men with suggestive impulses to similar crimes, by releasing a thing of hate and revenge to freer action on the lower astral plane. But capital punishment is guilty of all these crimes against the human being, and is thus of the greatest seriousness. And with capital punishment there is opportunity neither for reprieve nor pardon. (For other Lookout notes on the subject, see XVI, 46; XXIII, 233; XXIV, 572, and XXVII, 285.)

That Phantom Limb Again!

If the frequency with which references to "phantom limbs" appear in the public press be any indication, neurologists, psychologists, doctors and sundry other authorities concerned are finding it well-nigh impossible to "lay" this ghost. Lookout treated the case twice last year (see issues of Feb. and Nov., 1941), and now comes another contribution, entitled, "The Mystery of the Phantom Limb" (August *Magazine Digest*). It seems that "not only the layman, but the average medico is ignorant of this astounding phenomenon," even though "knowledge of the phantom limb must be as old as recovery from amputation. Lord Nelson believed that the phantom fingers of his amputated hand provided 'a direct proof of the existence of the soul'." The article recounts many instances of pain "in" the amputated part, and then quotes Professor S. Feldman, a psychologist at Cornell University:

> "As a rule, we are not aware of the several parts of the body. It is only when something goes wrong or something out of the ordinary happens to them that we sit up and take notice. The stiff limb calls attention to itself; the normal member receives little or no attention until it is missing. Thus it is the absent limb that makes a show of itself." (p. 86.)

Calling the Kettle "Superficial"

> Such an interpretation is considered superficial by the neurologist [Dr. George Riddoch, President of the Neurological Section of the Royal Society of Medicine]. According to him, in the process of healing, the divided nerves of the stump produce certain sensations which are interpreted in the patient's mind as if the limb were still present. During the stabilizing process of healing—in the case of the painless phantom—these sensations become correspondingly weaker so that the phantom gradually seems to come closer to the stump into which it finally disappears. A new shape of the body is now accepted.

> Dr. Riddoch also points out that the story of the phantom limb illustrates the individual's difficulty in accepting, physiologically as well as psychologically, a shortened limb; it also reveals the natural tendency of man to lengthen his limbs with the aid of man-made tools. . . . It has been maintained that the capacity to employ tools in this way is one of the main characteristics distinguishing man from animal. This aptitude varies in different individuals for reasons of training or inborn adaptability (pp. 86-7).

More Than a Mere Explanation

> The neurologist does more than give a mere explanation. He holds out hope for the phantom sufferer. In a considerable number of cases, Dr. Riddoch states, doctors have been successful in abolishing the pain by a surgical incision of the spinal cord. And the war, with its unbounded opportunities for medical research, may lead to the cure of the phantom limb itself (p. 87).

In view of the fact that the "cure of the phantom limb" would involve the amputation of an astral member, the theosophist can only hold his breath and hope that the war, "with its unbounded opportunities for medical research," may lead to no such thing! (For fuller treatment of astral principle in its relation to the "regeneration" of lost limbs, see THEOSOPHY XXV, 508.)

Progress Backward

In May, 1931, Lookout reported the statement of Supreme Court Justice Lewis of Brooklyn, who tried sixty-four divorce cases in one day, and, writing in the *Literary Digest,* presented his conclusion that childless homes were responsible for the almost complete absence of real home life. Civilization marches onward, if not upward, and today we read of Augusta (Georgia) Judge A. L. Franklin, whose story ran in the Los Angeles *Times* (Sept. 29) under the headline: "Judge, Granting 257 Divorces in Four Hours, Raps Humanity." After the four-hour session, the Judge declared that "if this is a sample of civilization, we are in a dickens of a fix."

> "Our churches, schools and other educational institutions have got to teach people more about the sanctity of marriage," the veteran jurist said. Most of the complaining partners charged mates with staying drunk, but the judge observed: "It takes a rich man to stay drunk all the time."

More teaching about the sanctity of marriage, by all means. But also, and in preparation, a few wholesome facts about the origin and destiny of Man, the Law and the Purpose of Life.

Other figures are given by Justice Stephen S. Jackson of New York City's Children's Court, who asserted (New York *Times,*

Oct. 28) that the adolescent girl is largely responsible for the ten per cent rise in juvenile delinquency in that city in the last year. This is "the most distressing and currently critical situation we have," according to the Justice, who said the broken home and the disruption of normal parental relationships were responsible. The report continues:

> He said that many young girls were left to their own resources while their mothers engaged in war work or took jobs formerly held by men. During the first nine months of 1942 there were 3,623 delinquency arraignments in the Children's Courts of New York City as compared with 3,279 in the corresponding period of 1941, he said.

These remarks were addressed to 200 social welfare workers at a conference called by the Social Group Work and Recreation Section of the Welfare Council of New York City.

Other Problems

> Amplifying Justice Jackson's remarks concerning the adolescent girl, Mrs. Beatrice Hodgins of the Board of Education said that it was difficult to show girls today that a high school education "was doing something for them." Many of them are being taken out of school for home duties and "to absorb the sorrow and anxiety of the mother" who has lost husband or son to the fighting forces, she said. She deplored the increase in the number of boys and girls under 18 who are "shopping around for jobs while they are still in high school" and who, if they find work, "will leave school."

These are aspects of "total" war that will not stop with an Armistice, nor will they disappear in a generation. (Other facts on the social problems aroused by war will be found in the September Lookout, where a few of the psychological effects were taken up.)

"None the Less Real"

> A problem "less specific but none the less real" also raised by the situation was the psychological impact of the war upon children [Justice Jackson] pointed out. "With their imagination they're drinking it in more than adults are," he said. He added that unless their emotions and reactions were guided they would seek anti-social channels "which we characterize as delinquent."
>
> He also raised the question of the leisure-time pursuits of the youngsters in boomtown areas, away from home for the first time, their pockets filled with cash, and scored the closing down of recreation centers and the cutting of WPA personnel here in New York.

Gang violence among juveniles, reported also in the September issue, continues to mount in the Los Angeles area, for instance, and comparable excesses are no doubt to be found in many other centers.

The evidence is that while war brings to the fore unexampled heroism, courage and selflessness on home fronts as well as battle fronts, unusual manifestations of the opposite nature are also to be noted.

World War II has been called a "war of ideas" and a "war of nerves." Can we not say that these mental and moral "wars," in human nature everywhere, are the real conflict on which the attention of educators should be focussed?

"COMICS ARE NO LONGER COMIC"

Along similar lines is an article in the *Christian Century* (Nov. 4) bearing the above title. Describing the cut-throat thrillers in comic strips read by "some 15,000,000 American children of grade and junior high school age," the article says:

> The most anti-nazi movie has not come within striking distance of what goes into these gaudy pages, while the effect of the occasional "horror" movie is infinitesimal beside that of the grotesque comic magazine which is in reach of any child with a dime to spend.

THE PROBLEM SIMPLIFIED

> The makers of these magazines have had a field day since Pearl Harbor. Before that, they were just as bloody, just as miracle-themed, but they were hard put to it to think up legitimate monsters: gangsters, perhaps, or mysterious "Claws" or wizards or cannibals. They could no longer use the once legitimate "reds" or "bolshevists." True, Orientals have always furnished good material as villains; no longer ago than last summer we had "Chen Chang, the villainous Chinese, plotting with fiendish wiles against the white race he hates." Now the problem is simplified; you simply put in a "Jap" or a "nazi" and make him the sort of monster with whom an ordinary gangster or cannibal could never hope to compete.
>
> The nightmarish fears being engendered, along with the wishful thinking aroused by the dependence on miracles as the way of escape from all danger, are tragic enough. But even more terrifying is the prospect of a young generation being inculcated with a hate and a color prejudice which will make postwar tolerance and understanding a practical impossibility. We looked with revulsion a few years ago at the primers created for German children, with their grotesque pictures of Jews as half-monsters, and decried the depravity which could place them in the hands of children whose concepts of people and events were just being formed. But those primers have nothing on the comics which today are eagerly devoured by most American school children, their picture of the Jew as impotent monster not half so terrifying as the ruthless, fanged Oriental or nazi monster in which the comic magazine specializes.

"A Mother's Verdict"

"The 'comics,' miscalled, are the staple reading of almost every child, and I am sure have more influence than school or church," a mother recently wrote *The Christian Century*. "Their gallant hero Daredevil has vowed that 'a hundred Japs shall fall for every drop of American blood spilled by their treachery'—which makes 'an eye for an eye' seem the height of humanitarianism. . . .

"One reason given for our fighting is to save the children of Europe from being reared in the doctrines of violence and racialism, but in doing so we have released a cloudburst of the same evils on our own children. I cannot feel that I was wrong when I expected this war to bring out in us the worst traits of the enemy."

Through history it will be seen, from the ancient Sumerians on, that people take on the characteristics of the ones they have fought. Lest we follow other bad examples now, we should deal immediately and intelligently with these social evils now before us.

Not Comic Figures

A committee of members of the American Association of University Women in Gary, Indiana, last year made a survey of the "comic" situation, questioning 696 grade school pupils:

During the week of the survey, these children had read 915 books, of which 137 could be termed "good." But they had read a total of 2,370 comic magazines, or about 34 a pupil. Thirty-five per cent had read *nothing* but comics!

These figures would seem to be representative of the extent to which the craze has taken hold in other localities. One drugstore news counter across the street from a public school building displays 94 different comic magazines from which pupils up to the sixth grade made daily purchases. "The fastest selling item in the store," the proprietor says of them. Latest estimates, made by *Parents Magazine,* show that there are about 125 different comic magazines appearing on at least 100,000 newsstands throughout the country, with approximately 15,000,000 copies sold a month—which adds up to 180,000,000 a year. Profits, of course, are tremendous. The annual "take" by the publishers of *Superman,* it is reported, is $1,500,000, including movie and radio rights, of which some $100,000 goes to the creators of the cartoons.

Newsstand sales and mail circulation, however, can give only a partial picture of reader coverage. One hears on every hand of twelve-year-old dealers in second-hand wares, of trading centers, of copies given away with Saturday afternoon movie admissions. A good guess would be to multiply each purchased copy by five readers.

"SUPERMAN" DAYDREAMS

> Although the superheroes are supposed to be dedicated to the service of freedom and democracy, their virtues and methods are purely fascist in nature. They gain success because they are supremely powerful; the superior mind always wins; they are ruthless as they pursue the evildoers; the most horrible means of death is not too cruel for them to use when they have finally brought the villains to bay.
>
> Educators point out that the "superman" element encourages daydreaming, convinces children that ordinary procedures are unworthy of consideration as ways of meeting problems, leads them to expect miracles instead of everyday means of solving difficulties.

A HOME-SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITY

Efforts are being made to remedy the situation. Sterling North, book editor of the Chicago *Daily News,* has launched "a one-man crusade against the menace of comic magazines." The *National Parent Teacher* "has been conducting a campaign for the past several months to awaken parents to the danger and to encourage the substitution of good books and 'things to do' with the hands during leisure hours." The article concludes:

> Most schools bar the magazine from the classroom; it is at home and on the way to and from school that the weird pages are devoured. It is a problem in which the home has at least an equal responsibility with the school.

Or, as Dr. Marynia F. Farnham, psychiatrist of the New York State Psychiatric Institute and Hospital, said recently, "Sound parenthood is perhaps the most vital tool we possess to enable us in sanity and normalcy to direct the future course." (New York *Times,* May 14.)

While all problems, to be sure, are problems of education, the problems of the young are particularly the province of parents and teachers, until the "age of responsibility" is reached.

Theosophical education would substitute for belief in miraculous escapes, the concept of an absolutely just universe; Theosophy exchanges license for *freedom* to think, to act and to choose; it calls "courage" that quality with which a man faces whatever comes to him, not defiantly, but thoughtfully, with the knowledge that the measure meted out to him is fair. Children learn tolerance, gentleness, and forgiveness as *laws* of evolution, and thus are attracted naturally to their practice.